

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

TRANSLATION

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

Date of mailing (day/month/year)	28.06.2005
-------------------------------------	-------------------

Applicant's or agent's file reference

NEG-427PCT

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/005093

International filing date (day/month/year)

22.03.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)

25.03.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

H04N7/15

Applicant

NEC CORPORATION

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP

Authorized officer

Facsimile No.

Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/005093

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐

This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language

_____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

☐

a sequence listing

☐

table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

☐

in written format

☐

in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing

☐

contained in the international application as filed.

☐

filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

☐

furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/005093

Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention

1. ☐ In response to the invitation (Form PCT/ISA/206) to pay additional fees the applicant has:
- ☐ paid additional fees
 - ☐ paid additional fees under protest
 - ☒ not paid additional fees

2. ☐ This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite the applicant to pay additional fees.

3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is

- ☐ complied with
- ☒ not complied with for the following reasons:

The special technical feature of the inventions set forth in claims 1-8, 10 and 12-18 relates to re-encoding the image of the speaker when switching speakers, and making the image of the first speaker image an intraframe. The special technical feature of the inventions set forth in claims 9 and 11 relates to transmission to a terminal of an intraframe transmission request when switching the speaker.

There is no technical relationship among these inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features; accordingly, they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept.

4. Consequently, this opinion has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:

- ☐ all parts
- ☒ the parts relating to claims Nos. 1-8, 10, 12-18

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/JP2005/005093

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement		
1. Statement			
Novelty (N)	Claims	1-8, 10, 12-18	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1-8, 10, 12-18	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-8, 10, 12-18	YES
	Claims		NO
2. Citations and explanations:			
<p>Document 1: JP 11-220711 A (Fujitsu Ltd.), 11 August 1999; paragraphs [0025]-[0042] and fig. 1-4</p> <p>Document 2: JP 2001-45495 A (NEC Engineering, Ltd.), 16 February 2001; paragraphs [0025]-[0033] and fig. 1</p> <p>Document 3: JP 7-107461 A (Sharp Corp.), 21 April 1995; paragraph 0006 and fig. 5</p> <p>Document 4: JP 2003-244130 A (Canon Inc.), 29 August 2003; paragraphs [0015]-[0016] and fig. 1</p> <p>Document 5: JP 3-99592 A (Fujitsu Ltd.), 24 April 1991; entire text and all drawings</p>			
<p>The inventions set forth in claims 1-2, 4-5, 12-13 and 17-18 do not involve an inventive step in the light of document 1. Document 1 (paragraphs [0025]-[0042] and fig. 1-4) discloses conference terminal devices wherein reference images corresponding to other conference terminal devices are stored in frame memory, and when the speaker changes the image of the speaker is immediately refreshed using the frame memory. Decoding and re-encoding in multipoint connection devices is merely known art disclosed in document 2 (paragraphs [0025]-[0033] and fig. 1) and document 3 (paragraph 0006</p>			

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/005093

Box No. V

Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement

and fig. 5); therefore, a person skilled in the art could easily express the capability of the terminals disclosed in document 1, in a multipoint connection device.

The invention set forth in claim 3 does not involve an inventive step in the light of document 1. UDP/IP, for example, is a known communication protocol which does not have a retransmission procedure.

The inventions set forth in claims 6-7 do not involve an inventive step in the light of document 1. Network conferencing connecting different types of networks is known art, as disclosed in document 4 (paragraphs [0015]-[0016] and fig. 1).

The inventions set forth in claims 8, 10 and 14-16 do not involve an inventive step in the light of document 1. Assessment of whether not to intraframe when the speaker changes in a multipoint connection device is known art as disclosed in document 5 (entire text and all drawings).

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/005093

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

In claim 7, the technical meaning of the expression "to be able to cope even when there is a plurality of image data transmitted from terminals connected to different networks" is unclear and is not fully supported by the description.

In claim 10, the technical meaning of the expression "to be able to cope even when there is a plurality of codec of image data from terminals connected to different networks" is unclear and is not fully supported by the description.